arXiv:1510.00814v3 [gr-qc] 18 Oct 2015

Effective Gravitational Theory at Large Scale with Lorentz Violation

Yiwei Wu[1], Xun Xue[1]*, Lixiang Yang[1], Tzu-Chiang Yuan[2]
[1]*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics, East China Normal University, No.500, Dongchuan Road, Shanghai 200241, China*
[2]*Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Nangang, Taipei 11529, Taiwan*

The dipole anomaly in the power spectrum of CMB may suggest that the Lorentz boost invariance may be violated at cosmic scale. Lorentz symmetry may not be an exact symmetry in Nature, it may be partially broken at the galaxy scale. We employ the symmetry of very special relativity as an example to illustrate the Lorentz violation effects by constructing the corresponding gauge theories as effective gravitational theories at large scale. One common feature of this class of gravitation models is the non-triviality of spacetime torsion and contorsion even if the matter source is consisted solely of scalar fields. The presence of non-trivial contorsion contributes to the effective energy-momentum distribution which may account partly if not all for the dark matter in the universe.

PACS numbers: 03.30.+p, 04.20.Cv, 11.15.-q,11.30.Cp

Introduction & Motivation Lorentz symmetry is one of the most established exact symmetries of Nature, withstand challenges by numerous experiments since the discovery of special relativity by Einstein over one hundred years ago. However, the idea of minuscle Lorentz violation attracts many attentions since 1990s. Possible Lorentz violation (LV) effects might come from quantum gravity which are nevertheless suppressed by Planck scale. On the other hand, all experimental results give very low upper bound on possible Lorentz violation. At the macroscopic scale, local Lorentz invariance is verified to very high accuracy within solar system. On the other hand, at the cosmic scale, the dipole anomaly in the power spectrum of cosmic microwave background (CMB) [1, 2] indicates that there exists a rest frame of CMB which breaks Lorentz invariance even in empty space far away from any galaxy. There is no direct signal on how the Lorentz symmetry behaves at large scale, *e.g.* scale of or larger than the galaxy. Neither is there any experimental test on it at such scale. On the contrary, there are some substantial evidences in astronomical observations indicating implicit deviations from predictions by general relativity or Newtonian gravitation theory, such as the galaxy rotation curve and the accelerating expansion of the universe, *etc.*

CMB also exhibits various anomalies at low multipoles and other puzzles, such as very large scale anisotropies, anomalous alignments, and non-Gaussian distributions [1]. The quadrupole ($l = 2$, spherical harmonic mode) has a low amplitude compared to the prediction of the standard cosmological (ΛCDM) theory. In particular, the quadrupole and octupole ($l = 3$) modes appear to have an unexplained alignment with each other and with both the ecliptic and equinoxes – this alignment was sometimes coined as the *axis of evil*. It seems that there is a conflict between the cosmological principle which states that the universe should be spatially isotropic and uniform, and the principle of relativity at cosmic scale. We are therefore facing the possibility of modifying one or even both of these principles when encountering problems at cosmic scale. Recall that when Einstein established his general relativity a century ago, he was strongly motivated by Mach's principle. One of the very general statement of Mach's principle is "Local physical laws are determined by the large-scale structure of the universe". It is therefore very inspiring to think about Mach's principle in formulating an effective gravitational theory at large scale. Local Lorentz symmetry could be violated at large scale due to *classical* gravitation effects.

We assume here that local Lorentz invariance is partly violated or partially broken from the scale of galaxy to the cosmic scale, while it is exact within the scale of solar system. In particular, Lorentz boost is violated in the cosmic scale. An effective gravitation theory at large scale should be formulated according to the above reasonings. How large of a region in spacetime can be regarded as local when we talk about local symmetry? It should be noted that the local requirements can actually be different depending on different physical phenomena. For the large scale gravitation effects, local may be very large compared with the typical laboratory scale of Lorentz invariant electromagnetic processes.

There appear many attempts on investigation of possible Lorentz violation from various theoretical aspects since the middle of 1990s. Coleman and Glashow [3] developed a perturbative framework to investigate the deviation from Lorentz invariance in which the departure of Lorentz invariance is parametrized in terms of a

* Correspondence author: xxue@phy.ecnu.edu.cn

fixed timelike four-vector or spurion. Colladay and Kostelecky [4] proposed an extension of the standard model Lagrangian by incorporating Lorentz and CPT violation perturbations of more general spurion-mediated terms induced by expectation values of Lorentz tensors due to spontaneous Lorentz symmetry breaking. More recently, Cohen and Glashow [5], proposed the very special relativity (VSR) in which CP violation is connected with Lorentz violation. They argued that the local symmetry of known observations may not be necessary as large as Lorentz symmetry but instead its subgroup would be enough provided that the subgroup can be enlarged to the full Lorentz group when discrete symmetry P, T or CP is incorporated. When CP is a good symmetry, the full spacetime symmetry is the complete Lorentz group. However, if CP is violated, as was observed in Nature, the spacetime symmetry may not be the complete Lorentz group anymore and hence Lorentz violation may be connected with CP violation. There are three subgroups of the Lorentz group that can be the symmetry group of VSR. Denote the Lorentz group generators as J_x, J_y and J_z, the rotation generators, and K_x, K_y and K_z, the Lorentz boost generators. Up to isomorphism the three VSR symmetry groups are $E(2)$ and $Hom(2)$ with three generators, and $Sim(2)$ with four generators. $E(2)$'s generators are T_1, T_2 and J_z, $Hom(2)$'s generators are T_1, T_2 and K_z, while $Sim(2)$'s generators are T_1, T_2, K_z and J_z. Here $T_1 = K_x + J_y$ and $T_2 = K_y - J_x$ are the two generators of an Abelian subgroup $T(2)$.

Effective Gravity at Large Scale To build the effective gravitational theory at large scale we employ the VSR model as an example to introduce the Lorentz violation by localizing the VSR symmetry to construct the VSR gauge theory as the corresponding gravitation theory. The construction of gravitation theory with gauge principle began just after the proposition of Yang-Mills field theory in 1954. Utiyama [6] was the pioneer to extend the gauge principle to non-compact Lie group, in particular the Lorentz group and found that general relativity can be viewed as a Lorentz symmetry gauge theory. Subsequently, more sophisticated Lorentz and Poincaré gauge theories were formulated by Sciama [7], Kibble [8], Ne′eman [9], Trautman [9], and Hehl [10] *etc.* The bridge Einstein employed to make transition from special relativity to general relativity was the equivalence principle, which can be stated as one can always transform away the gravity effect by choosing the appropriate reference frame at any point of spacetime. The spacetime is locally flat in such a reference frame which is known as the free falling reference frame. The orientation of coordinate axes varies freely from one spacetime point to the other and has independent locally Lorentz invariance. However, the locally flat coordinates can not be holonomic globally for a general spacetime manifold but are anholonomic coordinates in general. The coordinate transformation from locally flat or free falling coordinates to a general holonomic coordinates can be described by the tetrad or the vierbein fields $h_a^{\ \mu}$. The relation between the tetrad fields and the metric tensor of a spacetime manifold is

$$\eta_{ab} = g_{\mu\nu} h_a^{\ \mu} h_b^{\ \nu} \ , \tag{1}$$

and its inverse is

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{ab} h^a_{\ \mu} h^b_{\ \nu} \ . \tag{2}$$

The commutator $[h_a, h_b] = f^c_{ab} h_c$ for tetrad basis $h_a = h^\mu_a \partial_\mu$ is non-trivial for anholonomic coordinates in general.

At every spacetime point physics is dictated locally by special relativity via a well-defined relativistic field theory Lagrangian in terms of locally flat anholonomic coordinates. To transfer to the case with gravity, the local Lorentz invariance is guaranteed by introducing the Lorentzian gauge field, which behaves as the connection. Suppose the matter field ψ transforms according to the representation of Lorentz group $U(\Lambda(x))$ under the local Lorentz transformation $x^\mu \to \Lambda^\mu_\nu(x)\, x^\nu$, the local Lorentz invariance demands the Lagrangian in the Minkowski spacetime background $\mathcal{L}(\partial_\mu \psi, \cdots)$ to transform into $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_\mu \psi, \cdots)$, one in the curved spacetime background, where the covariant derivative $\mathcal{D}_\mu$ is defined through the Lorentz Lie algebra S_{ab} generators as $\mathcal{D}_\mu = \partial_\mu - \frac{i}{2} A^{ab}{}_\mu S_{ab}$ by the gauge principle. Here $A_\mu = \frac{1}{2} A^{ab}{}_\mu S_{ab}$ is known as the Lorentzian gauge field or the Lorentzian connection. If local Poincaré invariance is taking into account, the tetrad fields $h_a^{\ \mu}$ can be regarded as gauge potential of the local translation of spacetime in some sense, while the curvature and torsion are the field strengths for Lorentz connection and tetrad field respectively, $[D_a, D_b] = T_{ab}{}^p D_p + \frac{i}{2} R_{ab}{}^{pq} S_{pq}$.

The choice of gauge invariant action for the gauge field $A^{ab}_{\ \mu}$ and tetrad field $h_a^{\ \mu}$ in the locally Lorentz invariant theory need to obey local Lorentz gauge transformation invariant and local Lorentz invariant. Both Yang-Mills type and Hilbert-Einstein one are acceptable. However, for action of Yang-Mills type the coupling constant is dimensionless and there is no Newtonian gravity limit, while for the action of Hilbert-Einstein type it can be proved to lead to general relativity. The action for Poincaré gauge theory can be also chosen as Yang-Mills type [10], and for the general linear group $GL(4, R)$ see [11]. However, there are some ambiguities in the Yang-Mills type of non-compact gauge theory.

The starting point for the gravity part of Lorentz gauge theory is then

$$S_E = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int d^4x h R_{ab}{}^{ab} \ , \tag{3}$$

where $h = \det\left(h^a_{\ \mu}\right)$. The equations of motion (EoM) for connection give a set of constraint equations for $A^{ab}_{\ \ \mu}$, $\mathcal{D}_\nu\left(h\left(h_a{}^\nu h_b{}^\mu - h_a{}^\mu h_b{}^\nu\right)\right) = 0$, which implies the Levi-Civita connection. The EoM for tetrad fields are the Einstein field equations

$$R^a{}_c - \frac{1}{2}\delta_c{}^a R = 0\,. \tag{4}$$

In the presence of matter field, the theory is not torsion free in general, the scalar source implies torsion free theory while spinor and vector source gives non-trivial torsion distribution. However, macroscopic sources are either scalar or non-polarized electromagnetic field which lead to torsion free gravity, the general relativity.

To introduce Lorentz violation into the large scale effective gravitation theory, we take $Sim\,(2)$ symmetry as an illustration. For a local $Sim\,(2)$ theory, one just need to restrict the local symmetry transformation on $Sim\,(2)$,

$$\psi \xrightarrow{x^\mu \to \Lambda^\mu{}_\nu x^\nu} U\left(\Lambda\left(x\right)\right)\psi, \quad \Lambda\left(x\right) \in Sim\left(2\right)\,. \tag{5}$$

In the case of $SIM\,(2)$, the gauge potential takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} A_\mu &= \frac{1}{2}A^{ab}{}_\mu S_{ab}\,, \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(A^{10}{}_\mu + A^{31}{}_\mu\right)T_1 + \frac{1}{2}\left(A^{20}{}_\mu - A^{23}{}_\mu\right)T_2 \\ &\quad + A^{30}{}_\mu K_3 + A^{12}{}_\mu J_3 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\left(A^{20}{}_\mu + A^{23}{}_\mu\right)\left(S_{20} + S_{23}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\left(A^{10}{}_\mu - A^{31}{}_\mu\right)\left(S_{10} - S_{31}\right)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The restriction on $Sim\,(2)$ implies

$$A^{10}{}_\mu - A^{31}{}_\mu = 0\,, \quad A^{20}{}_\mu + A^{23}{}_\mu = 0\,, \tag{7}$$

which can be realized by taking the action in the form

$$\begin{aligned} S_E = \frac{1}{16\pi G}\int d^4x h\left(R^{ab}{}_{ab}\right. \\ \left. + \lambda_1^\mu\left(A^{10}{}_\mu - A^{31}{}_\mu\right) + \lambda_2^\mu\left(A^{20}{}_\mu + A^{23}{}_\mu\right)\right)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $\lambda_1{}^\mu$ and $\lambda_2{}^\mu$ are the Lagrange multipliers. The EoM for connection give constraints on tetrad and contorsion

$$\begin{aligned} &D_\nu\left(h\left(h_a{}^\nu h_b{}^\mu - h_a{}^\mu h_b{}^\nu\right)\right) \\ &= \lambda_1^\mu h\left(\delta_a{}^1\delta_b{}^0 - \delta_a{}^3\delta_b{}^1\right) + \lambda_2^\mu h\left(\delta_a{}^2\delta_b{}^0 - \delta_a{}^2\delta_b{}^3\right)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

which can be reduced to

$$\mathcal{D}_\nu\left(h\left(h_1{}^\nu h_0{}^\mu - h_1{}^\mu h_0{}^\nu\right)\right) = -\mathcal{D}_\nu\left(h\left(h_3{}^\nu h_1{}^\mu - h_3{}^\mu h_1{}^\nu\right)\right), \tag{10}$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\nu\left(h\left(h_2{}^\nu h_0{}^\mu - h_2{}^\mu h_0{}^\nu\right)\right) = \mathcal{D}_\nu\left(h\left(h_2{}^\nu h_3{}^\mu - h_2{}^\mu h_3{}^\nu\right)\right), \tag{11}$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\nu\left(h\left(h_3{}^\nu h_0{}^\mu - h_3{}^\mu h_0{}^\nu\right)\right) = 0\,, \tag{12}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_\nu\left(h\left(h_1{}^\nu h_2{}^\mu - h_1{}^\mu h_2{}^\nu\right)\right) = 0\,. \tag{13}$$

The spin connection can be decomposed into torsionless part and contorsion $A^a{}_{bc} = \tilde{A}^a{}_{bc} + K^a{}_{bc}$, where $\widetilde{A}^a{}_{bc} = \frac{1}{2}\left(f_b{}^a{}_c + f_c{}^a{}_b - f^a{}_{bc}\right)$, $K^a{}_{bc} = \frac{1}{2}\left(T_b{}^a{}_c + T_c{}^a{}_b - T^a{}_{bc}\right)$ and $T^a{}_{bc}$ is the torsion tensor. The constraint relations (10), (11), (12) and (13) can reduce the number of independent components of contorsion from 24 to 8, namely $K^{10}{}_0$, $K^{10}{}_1$, $K^{10}{}_2$, $K^{20}{}_0$, $K^{30}{}_0$, $K^{30}{}_1$, $K^{30}{}_2$, and $K^{12}{}_0$. The constraint (7) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} &2f^0{}_{10} + f^0{}_{31} - f^1{}_{30} + f^3{}_{10} = 0\,, \\ &f^1{}_{10} + f^1{}_{31} = 0\,, \\ &f^0{}_{12} - f^1{}_{20} + f^3{}_{12} - f^2{}_{10} + f^1{}_{23} - f^2{}_{31} = 0\,, \\ &f^1{}_{30} + f^0{}_{31} + f^3{}_{10} + 2f^3{}_{31} = 0\,, \\ &2f^0{}_{20} - f^2{}_{30} + f^3{}_{20} - f^0{}_{23} = 0\,, \\ &f^2{}_{10} + f^2{}_{31} + f^0{}_{12} + f^3{}_{12} + f^1{}_{20} - f^1{}_{23} = 0\,, \\ &f^2{}_{23} - f^2{}_{20} = 0 \\ &f^2{}_{03} + f^0{}_{23} + 2f^3{}_{23} - f^3{}_{20} = 0\,. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The tetrad EoM takes the form of (4). For only the symmetric part of connection can affect motion of particle through the geodesic equation, we decompose the curvature with the help of decomposition of spin connection as

$$R^{mn}{}_{ab} = \tilde{R}^{mn}{}_{ab} + R_K{}^{mn}{}_{ab} + R_{CK}{}^{mn}{}_{ab}\,, \tag{15}$$

where $\tilde{R}^{mn}{}_{ab}$ and $R_K{}^{mn}{}_{ab}$ are the curvatures composed of torsion-free connection and contorsion respectively, while $R_{CK}{}^{mn}{}_{ab}$ contains cross terms of them. We can rewrite (4) as

$$\tilde{R}^a_c - \frac{1}{2}\delta_c{}^a\tilde{R} = 8\pi G\left(T_{Sim(2)}\right)_c{}^a\,, \tag{16}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \left(T_{Sim(2)}\right)_c{}^a = \frac{1}{8\pi G}\left(\frac{1}{2}\delta_c{}^a\left(R_K + R_{CK}\right)\right. \\ \left. - \left(R_{Kc}{}^a + R_{CKc}{}^a\right)\right)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The force exerting on a particle moving in the gravitation field is supplied by the torsion free part of the connection, the curvature of which satisfies the Einstein field equation with the effective energy-momentum tensor $T_{Sim(2)}$ of Eq. (17) generated by an effective matter distribution formally. It is worthy to note that $T_{Sim(2)}$ will disappear if there is no matter distribution all over the

space, *i.e.* Minkowski spacetime is still the vacuum solution. To include the source matter distribution, suppose the variation of the matter field action is

$$\delta S_M = \int d^4xh \left(\frac{1}{2}\delta h^c{}_a (T_M)_c{}^a + \delta A^{ab}{}_\mu (C_M)_{ab}{}^\mu\right) ,$$

the complete gravitation equation will be

$$\tilde{R}_c{}^a - \frac{1}{2}\delta_c{}^a \tilde{R} = 8\pi G\big(T_{Sim(2)} + T_M\big)_c{}^a . \qquad (18)$$

The effective energy-momentum tensor $T_{Sim(2)}$ contributes to the gravitation in addition to matter contribution T_M and appears as the dark side of the matter. Different source matter distribution is expected to give rise different dark distribution. The spherical or axial symmetric galaxy like source matter is expected to lead to the possible contribution to dark matter effectively.

The complete constraints on the connection originated from (10), (11), (12) and (13) become

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_\nu \left(h \left(h_1{}^\nu h_0{}^\mu - h_1{}^\mu h_0{}^\nu\right)\right) + D_\nu \left(h \left(h_3{}^\nu h_1{}^\mu - h_3{}^\mu h_1{}^\nu\right)\right) \\ = 16\pi G \left[(C_M)_{10}{}^\mu + (C_M)_{31}{}^\mu\right] ,\end{aligned} \qquad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_\nu \left(h \left(h_2{}^\nu h_0{}^\mu - h_2{}^\mu h_0{}^\nu\right)\right) - D_\nu \left(h \left(h_2{}^\nu h_3{}^\mu - h_2{}^\mu h_3{}^\nu\right)\right) \\ = 16\pi G \left[(C_M)_{20}{}^\mu - (C_M)_{23}{}^\mu\right] ,\end{aligned} \qquad (20)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\nu \left(h \left(h_3{}^\nu h_0{}^\mu - h_3{}^\mu h_0{}^\nu\right)\right) = 16\pi G (C_M)_{30}{}^\mu , \qquad (21)$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_\nu \left(h \left(h_1{}^\nu h_2{}^\mu - h_1{}^\mu h_2{}^\nu\right)\right) = 16\pi G (C_M)_{12}{}^\mu , \qquad (22)$$

which lead to non-trivial torsion even in the scalar source-free case of $C_M = 0$ and hence the non-trivial effective energy-momentum tensor $T_{Sim(2)}$ can contribute at least partly to possible dark matter effect.

The discussions for other VSR symmetry groups are similar. The constraint conditions for local $Hom(2)$ symmetry gauge theories are

$$A^{10}{}_c - A^{31}{}_c = 0, \quad A^{20}{}_c + A^{23}{}_c = 0, \quad A^{12}{}_c = 0 , \qquad (23)$$

while the 24 components of contorsion can be reduced to 12 independent ones, *e.g.*

$$\begin{aligned}&K^{10}{}_0, K^{10}{}_1, K^{10}{}_2, K^{20}{}_0, K^{20}{}_1, K^{30}{}_0 , \\ &K^{30}{}_1, K^{30}{}_2, K^{12}{}_0, K^{23}{}_1, K^{23}{}_3, K^{31}{}_1 .\end{aligned} \qquad (24)$$

In the case of $C_M = 0$, the 12 constraint conditions (23) can be reduced to

$$\begin{aligned}&K^{10}{}_0 - K^{31}{}_3 = 2f^0{}_{10} + f^0{}_{31} - f^1{}_{30} + f^3{}_{10} , \\ &K^{20}{}_1 + K^{23}{}_1 = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(f^1{}_{20} - f^0{}_{12} + f^2{}_{10} - f^1{}_{23} - f^3{}_{12} + f^2{}_{31}\right), \\ &K^{20}{}_0 + K^{23}{}_3 = 2f^0{}_{20} - f^0{}_{23} - f^2{}_{30} + f^3{}_{20} , \\ &K^{12}{}_0 = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(-f^0{}_{12} - f^1{}_{20} + f^2{}_{10}\right) , \\ &K^{30}{}_2 = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(2f^0{}_{20} - f^0{}_{23} - f^2{}_{30} + f^3{}_{20} - 2f^1{}_{12}\right) , \\ &K^{30}{}_1 = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(2f^0{}_{10} + f^0{}_{31} - f^1{}_{30} + f^3{}_{10} + 2f^2{}_{12}\right) ,\end{aligned} \qquad (25)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&f^0{}_{10} + f^0{}_{31} + f^3{}_{10} + f^3{}_{31} = 0 , \\ &f^1{}_{10} - f^1{}_{31} = 0 , \\ &f^1{}_{20} - f^1{}_{23} + f^2{}_{10} + f^2{}_{31} = 0 , \\ &f^0{}_{20} - f^0{}_{23} + f^3{}_{20} - f^3{}_{23} = 0 , \\ &f^2{}_{23} - f^2{}_{20} = 0 , \\ &3f^1{}_{23} - 2f^1{}_{20} + f^2{}_{31} - f^3{}_{12} = 0 .\end{aligned} \qquad (26)$$

For the $E(2)$ case, the constraint conditions (23) become

$$A^{10}{}_c - A^{31}{}_c = 0 , \quad A^{20}{}_c + A^{23}{}_c = 0 , \quad A^{30}{}_c = 0 , \qquad (27)$$

and 12 independent components of contorsion can be chosen as

$$\begin{aligned}&K^{10}{}_0, \ K^{10}{}_1, \ K^{10}{}_2, K^{10}{}_3, K^{20}{}_0, \ K^{20}{}_2 , \\ &K^{20}{}_3, K^{30}{}_0, K^{30}{}_1, K^{30}{}_2, K^{12}{}_0, \ K^{31}{}_1 .\end{aligned} \qquad (28)$$

In the case of $C_M = 0$, the 12 constraint conditions (27) can be reduced to

$$\begin{aligned}&K^{10}{}_0 - K^{10}{}_3 = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(-2f^0{}_{10} - f^0{}_{31} + f^1{}_{30} - f^3{}_{10}\right) , \\ &K^{20}{}_3 - K^{20}{}_0 = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(2f^0{}_{20} - f^0{}_{23} - f^2{}_{30} + f^3{}_{20}\right) , \\ &K^{10}{}_1 - K^{31}{}_1 = f^2{}_{23} - f^2{}_{20} , \\ &K^{30}{}_0 = f^0{}_{30} , \\ &K^{30}{}_1 = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(f^0{}_{31} - f^1{}_{30} - f^3{}_{10}\right) , \\ &K^{30}{}_2 = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(-f^3{}_{20} - f^0{}_{23} - f^2{}_{30}\right) ,\end{aligned} \qquad (29)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&f^0{}_{10} + f^0{}_{31} + f^3{}_{10} + f^3{}_{31} = 0 , \\ &f^1{}_{10} + f^1{}_{31} - f^2{}_{20} + f^2{}_{23} = 0 , \\ &f^1{}_{20} - f^1{}_{23} + f^2{}_{10} + f^2{}_{31} = 0 , \\ &f^0{}_{20} - f^0{}_{23} + f^3{}_{20} - f^3{}_{23} = 0 , \\ &f^0{}_{12} + f^3{}_{12} = 0 , \\ &f^0{}_{30} + f^1{}_{10} + f^1{}_{31} + f^3{}_{30} = 0 .\end{aligned} \qquad (30)$$

We also take $T(2)$ symmetry into account, with 16 constraint equations and 16 independent components of contorsion. We can arrive at the conclusion that all VSR gauge theories are gravity theories with non-trivial torsion in general. We propose that at least part of the dark matter effects might be induced by contorsion contributions.

<u>*Discussions*</u> In this paper, we begin with the analysis of dipole anomaly of CMB power spectrum and speculate that at the cosmic scale boost invariance is implicitly broken. However, at scale larger than the galaxy, the boost invariance may not be broken totally. The VSR symmetry is illustrated as an example of large scale local symmetry and its corresponding gravity theory is constructed. Evidence of the Lorentz violation effect in all these constructions is the existence of non-trivial torsion contributing an effective energy-momentum distribution

which may be regarded as the source from the dark side of matter. The dark matter effect might be an emergent phenomenon from large scale Lorentz violation in gravitation. The implicit galaxy rotation curve based on the implicit solution of contorsion in the presence of spherical or axial symmetric source is still needed to be solved.

The approach discussed in this letter may also have cosmological application. There will be an effective contorsion contribution, which may serve as the effective dark energy, in the Robertson-Walker like solution based on cosmological principle. Well known issues like the Boulware-Deser ghost [12] and the Zakharov discontinuity [13, 14] encountered in massive gravity theory are needed to be reexamined in the present approach. Deser and Woodard [15] proposed a non-local gravity model to take in account both dark matter as well as dark energy. In our opinion, large scale behavior of gravity must have some non-local features. It is also interesting to investigate the relation between the two approaches.

At any rate, it will be very important to clarify the mechanism of Lorentz violation at large scale. Does the Lorentz symmetry breakdown happen suddenly at some scale, *e.g.* galaxy scale, or cascading or gradually depending on some continuous parameters? How do we construct the model? Is the origin of Lorentz violation at large scale the accumulation of other shorter scales? Is there any relation between Lorentz violating gravity and new physics beyond the standard model? We would like to investigate and hopefully provide answers to some of these issues in the future.

Acknowledgment We would like to thank W. B. Yeung for helpful discussions. XX would like to thank the hospitality of the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics China at the Chinese Academy of Sciences in Beijing where this paper was completed. This work is partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, under Grant No. 11435005.

[1] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], Astron. Astrophys. **571**, A1 (2014) [arXiv:1303.5062 [astro-ph.CO]].
[2] A. Kogut *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **419**, 1 (1993) [astro-ph/9312056].
[3] S. R. Coleman and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 116008 (1999) [hep-ph/9812418].
[4] D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 116002 (1998) [hep-ph/9809521].
[5] A. G. Cohen and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 021601 (2006) [hep-ph/0601236].
[6] R. Utiyama, Phys. Rev. **101**, 1597 (1956).
[7] D. W. Sciama, "On the analog between charge and spin in general relativity," in Recent Developments in General Relativity, Festschrift for Leopold Infeld, p. 415, Pergamon Press, New York, NY, USA, (1962).
[8] T. W. B. Kibble, J. Math. Phys. **2**, 212 (1961).
[9] Y. Ne′eman, "Gravity, Groups, And Gauges," in Held, A.(Ed.): General Relativity and Gravitation, Vol.1, 309-328; A. Trautman, "Fiber Bundles, Gauge Fields, And Gravitation," *ibid*, 287-308.
[10] F. W. Hehl, P. Von Der Heyde, G. D. Kerlick and J. M. Nester, Rev. Mod. Phys. **48**, 393 (1976).
[11] Y. Yang and W. B. Yeung, arXiv:1205.2690 [physics.gen-ph].
[12] D. G. Boulware and S. Deser, Phys. Rev. D **6**, 3368 (1972).
[13] H. van Dam and M. J. G. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B **22**, 397 (1970).
[14] V. I. Zakharov, JETP Lett. **12**, 312 (1970) [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **12**, 447 (1970)].
[15] S. Deser and R. P. Woodard, JCAP **1311**, 036 (2013) [arXiv:1307.6639 [astro-ph.CO]].